

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-10 and 13-20 are rejected, while claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 are objected to. By this paper, claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 15, 19 and 20 are amended, and claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 are canceled. Based on the following, consideration of the amended claims, and reconsideration of the remaining claims, are requested.

### **Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-10 and 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,792,750 (Nagai et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,371 (Orzel et al.). At the outset, Applicants note that claim 20 was included with the set of rejected claims in the Office Action Summary, but was not included in the rejections under the Detailed Action. This was discussed by telephone with the Examiner on 3 May 2007, and the Examiner indicated that claim 20 should have been included with the rejected claims in the Detailed Action. By this paper, the three independent claims—claims 1, 10 and 19—are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. For example, claim 1 now includes limitations from claims 2 and 3, which are accordingly canceled. Amended claim 1 further defines the at least one process that the controller is configured to perform. The same is true for amended claims 10 and 19, each of which is believed to be allowable. Claim 10 was amended to include limitations from claims 11 and 12, which are accordingly canceled.

Minor amendments were also made to claims 4 and 6 to bring these dependent claims in conformance with the amendment to claim 1. Similarly, claims 13 and 15 were amended so that they conform with the amendment to claim 10. Finally, claim 20 was amended so that it conforms with the amendment to claim 19. Amended claim 1 is the base claim for claims 4-9; amended claim 10 is the base claim for claims 13-18; and amended claim 19 is the base claim for claim 20. Each of these dependent claims contains all of the limitations of its respective base claim, as well as additional limitations that further distinguish it from the cited references. As discussed below, the Examiner objected to claims 2 and 3, and

also to claims 11 and 12. Limitations from these claims have been incorporated into their respective base claims, amended claims 1 and 10. Amended claim 19 also includes limitations similar to those found in claims 2-3 and 11-12. Therefore, each of the pending claims is believed to be allowable.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that each would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above, limitations from claims 2 and 3 have been incorporated into amended claim 1, and limitations from claims 11 and 12 have been incorporated into amended claim 10. In addition, limitations similar to those found in claims 2-3 and 11-12 have been incorporated into amended claim 19. Therefore, each of the independent claims—claims 1, 10 and 19—is believed to be allowable, and each of the remaining dependent claims—4-9, 13-18 and 20—is also believed to be allowable. Accordingly, allowance of each of the pending claims is requested.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Ford Global Technologies, LLC Deposit Account No. 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,

**Shawn Midlam-Mohler**

By /Marc F. Malooley/  
Marc F. Malooley  
Reg. No. 50,624  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: May 7, 2007

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351